

R E M A R K S

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because the piston 7 is not shown hatched. Applicant submits a replacement drawing sheet herewith showing the piston hatched. No new matter is added.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 to 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 as non-enabled. In order to make a rejection for nonenablement, the examiner has the initial burden to establish a reasonable basis to question the enablement provided for the claimed invention. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicant submits that the claims are, in fact, enabled as can be seen from applicant's drawings as originally filed and as shown in the replacement drawing sheet. An unedited exploded view of originally filed Figure 1, as scanned by the PTO and published on its PAIR website, is attached hereto as an Exhibit. It can be more clearly seen from the enlarged Figure 1 that the piston assembly 34 is situated such that it slips freely within the tube 9. Fuel is sealed within the tube 9 by o-rings 16 and 18. The piston assembly 34 consists of a piston 8 which has an axial opening 13 that allows fuel to pass through the piston 8. At one end the piston 8 has a machine ball seat 11 that accepts machine ball 17. The machine ball 17 and machine ball seat 11 work together to form an inertial check valve during piston travel. To retain the machine ball 17, the piston 8 is fitted with a piston end cap 7. The piston end cap 7 traps the machine ball 17 that allows the machine ball 17 to move away from the piston 8 during first direction of travel and against the machine ball seat 11 of the piston 8 during the second direction of travel. The piston end cap 7 is retained on the piston 8 by the piston end cap retainer 12. The piston end cap 7 has outlet openings such that the fuel flows between the machine ball 17 and the piston end cap 7.

One of ordinary skill in the fuel pump art would readily recognize the arrangement of Figure 1, particularly when enlarged as attached. As described above, enlarged originally-filed Figure 1 fully enables claims 5 through 24.

Based on the foregoing, the allowance of claims 5-24 is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application on the next Office Action, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the purpose of arranging an interview.

Respectfully submitted,



Nelson D. Nolte, Reg. No. 42,938
Polster, Lieder, Woodruff & Lucchesi, LC
12412 Powerscourt Dr. Ste. 200
St. Louis, Missouri 63131
Tel: (314) 238-2400
Fax: (314) 238-2401